

"A BOROUGH.—A Gentleman of *fortune* and respectability will hear of one, by immediately applying to Mr. Prince, Bookseller, Old North-street, Red Lion-square."—MORNING POST, 1st May, 1807.

"SEAT IN A CERTAIN ASSEMBLY.—Any Gentleman having the *Disposal* of a *Close One*, may apply to Mr. Francis, Stationer Cross-street, Hatton-garden."—MORNING POST, 2d May, 1807.

"PATRONAGE.—Wanted, by a Gentleman of *high honour and character*, a respectable *Official Situation*, in England (either a *Sinecure*, or one which does not require constant attendance), for which an *adequate compensation will be given*, according to the annual produce. The most satisfactory reference will be given and required, previous to any treaty being entered into. Apply by letter (post paid) to A. B. at Mr. O. Turner's, law stationer, Chancery-lane."—MORNING CHRONICLE, 30th April, 1807.

"Wanted to *Purchase*, the next *Presentation to a Living* from 300l. to 500l. per annum, with the prospect of an early vacancy. Address, post-paid, to A. B. Strawbridge and Tyler's, 73, Warren-street, Fitzroy-square."—MORNING CHRONICLE, 30th April, 1807.

825]

[826

TO THE
FREE AND INDEPENDENT ELECTORS
OF THE
CITY AND LIBERTIES OF WESTMINSTER.
LETTER XV.

GENTLEMEN,

I have long been afraid of wearying you with my unasked-for observations and advice; but, though I do not see, that, under the present circumstances, any thing that I can say is at all likely to produce any immediate effect upon your conduct, or, at least, any effect that can be of conspicuous utility to the public cause, I cannot refrain from addressing to you this one letter, first upon a topic or two of a more general nature, connected with the elections now going forward, and next upon the subject of your own election.

One of those topics is the recent exposure with regard to a great defalcation in the Army-Pay-Office, to prevent the publication of the report relating to which the partizans of the late ministry represent as one of the principal causes of the dissolution of parliament. Indeed, those ministers themselves so represent it; for we find the representation distinctly made in the address of Lord Howick to his constituents, the freeholders of Northumberland. Mr. Whitbread says the same in his address, and so does Mr. Herbert. In my last letter some observations were made upon this subject; but, since the publication of that letter, an elaborate defence of Mr. Rose, as having been made acquainted with the defalcation, has appeared in the *Courier* newspaper, which defence is, apparently, written either by Mr. Rose himself, or by some person nearly as much interested in the matter as he is, and on which, after inserting it, as I now

am about to do, I shall have to beseech your attention to a few short remarks.—
"The facts stated to the Committee of Finance by Mr. Rose, were, *that on the 10th of February, 1806*, (some days after he had actually retired from the Pay-Office), three of the senior clerks called upon him at his house, respecting some matters that had passed in the office in his time, and to thank him for marks of attention, &c.; and that on their going out of the room, one of them (not the accountant, whose duty it was to have made the disclosure) turned about, and said that a circumstance of an extraordinary nature had occurred in the time of his predecessors; that MR. STEELE had in 1798, and 1800, applied two sums amounting to 19,000l. or thereabouts, out of the cash in the hands of the Pay-Master-General, on giving his own receipt for the same, without any authority from the Treasury or the War Office; at which statement Mr. Rose expressed great surprise, and, to the accountant, some resentment at the communication having been delayed till he was out of office, when he could apply no possible remedy; observing, that the transaction was upon the face of it, at least, a most irregular one; but that from his long knowledge of Mr. Steele, he was persuaded that he would be able to explain it, so as to acquit himself of having done any thing more than taking upon himself a serious responsibility; that he probably had vouchers in his possession; but that in any event it had been his (the accountant's) duty to remind Mr. Steele of the transaction on his quitting office in 1804, in order that, if it had not been satisfactorily explained, he might then have stated it to Mr. Rose and his colleague, on

“ their appointment; to which the accountant answered, he had called two or three times at Mr. Steele's door, without finding him: which conduct appeared to render the conduct of the accountant less excusable, because if he thought it necessary to see Mr. Steele on the subject, he certainly should have apprized him of his wish to do so to ensure his meeting with him. Mr. Rose therefore desired him to write to Mr. Steele to render his seeing him certain, and to let Mr. Rose know on his return from Buckden, whether any interposition of his with Mr. Steele would be necessary.—Lord Temple has stated that Mr. Rose declined even to give advice to the accountant on the subject. On the 11th of February Mr. Rose went to Buckden, and returned the 19th; on the 20th the accountant called on him and told him he had seen Mr. Steele, who said generally that the sums before mentioned were received by him for army services of a secret nature. The accountant's statement of his interview with Mr. Steele was so little satisfactory to Mr. Rose, that the latter went to Mr. Steele on the morning of the 21st, from whom he could obtain no clear explanation of the business: Mr. Steele said Mr. Rose must excuse his entering into particulars at present, as he did not feel himself at liberty to do so; *that the advances were made to a person or persons for services of a secret nature*; that the whole would be repaid, but that he could not at the moment fix the precise time, acknowledging *that he had no warrant or other authority whatever for the issue*. Mr. Rose then observed to him, that under such circumstances he (Mr. Steele) should see Lord Grenville or the present Paymaster - General, and explain so much of the transaction as should satisfy them; the whole of it certainly if they should think it necessary; adding that it was beyond all comparison better he should do that in the first instance, as from himself, than wait to give an explanation when he should be called upon to do so; stating too, that as the matter had been spoken of publicly in the office, *it would soon become a topic in a wide circle*;—that this appeared to be the more important, as the precedent would shew to future paymasters general the possibility of their taking money placed in the Bank on the account of the public for their own private accommodation at any time, when they should find themselves under a pressing urgency to do so, *which was plainly*

“ *against the spirit of the Pay Office Act.*
 “ —Instead, therefore, of the indifference imputed to Mr. Rose on the subject, the whole of this communication with the Accountant and Mr. Steele, shews his anxiety about it. But *he could not reconcile to himself to become AN INFORMER, out of office*, against a man *universally beloved, with whom he had no private intercourse whatever from political differences.*—Not content with this verbal communication with Mr. Steele, Mr. Rose in the afternoon of the same day, wrote to Mr. Steele, repeating what he had urged to him in the morning; and added, that *however he might be justified in taking such responsibility upon himself by the exigency of the case*, it was not desirable that a paymaster-general should have the power of applying money in his hands, at his own will, without any authority whatever, &c. &c. &c.; and then went on to say that his (Mr. Steele's) making the communication he recommended, would remove the difficulty he (Mr. Rose) was under, of giving the accountant advice out of office: which he (the accountant) ought not to have called upon him (Mr. Rose) to do then, never having even alluded to the matter till after his retirement from it.
 “ —To which letter, on the 23d, Mr. Steele answered, he would certainly follow the advice given, and take an early opportunity of communicating to Lord Grenville the circumstances which related to the issue of the two sums in question; and that Mr. Rose might therefore, if he thought proper, apprise the accountant of that intention.—On the 14th of February, Mr. Rose wrote two letters from Buckden, to the accountant, on the subject. And after his return to town, he wrote to the accountant on the 24th, to acquaint him with the assurance he had from Mr. Steele of his intended communication with Lord Grenville, and concluded with telling him, that *as no communication whatever was made to him (Mr. Rose) while he was in office, he did not think he could then with propriety give any further advice on the subject*; and Mr. Rose hearing at the time no further mention of it from any quarter, **FELT A CONVICTION,** that a **SATISFACTORY** explanation had been given by Mr. Steele to Lord Grenville, relative to the services for which the sums were received by him; and the matter was completely discharged from his mind, till on the 9th of last February he

“ received an official letter from Lord Temple dated the 7th, stating he had discovered the two issues having been made without any authority, and that as he found the circumstance was communicated to him some days before Mr. Rose resigned the paymastership, *desired he would refer him to the documents in the office, in which he might find any minute or memorandum of it.* It now appears by the Treasury minutes, that Lord Temple made the disclosure to that board the 31st of January: this attempt to implicate Mr. Rose must therefore have been an afterthought. To which Mr. Rose instantly answered, that the circumstance alluded to was *not communicated to him till after he had quitted the Pay-Office; he could therefore make no minute, nor give any direction upon it; about which, as there were three gentlemen present at the time when the communication was made, any possibility of a mistake was precluded.*—It now appears that so early as on the 31st of January last, and the 4th and 6th of February, Lord Temple acquainted Lord Grenville with the discovery made to him of the issue of the two sums, and that in consequence thereof, a minute of the treasury board was made on the 10th, calling upon Mr. Steele to pay the said sum, the first having been previously paid; and that other minutes were made on the 26th of February and 19th of March on the same business, in no one of which does there appear to be the slightest imputation of any thing tending to criminality in the transaction, no censure, no rebuke; nothing but directions about the repayment. The lords of the treasury, therefore, tacitly sanctioned what had been done by Mr. Steele, so far, at least, as not blaming his conduct. And yet a charge is attempted to be sustained against Mr. Rose, for not informing of it when out of office, *by endeavouring to prove he was informed of it when in the public service.* He had however positively retired from his employment several days before the 10th of February, 1806, and went on the 11th to Buckden for a week. The King's appointment of his successors *(it is found on inquiry) was not signed till the 13th, but of that he knew nothing till within the last fortnight;* and the time when the cash at the bank was transferred to his successor, he was ignorant of till he saw it in the Morning Chronicle last week. It was therein stated not to have taken place till the 24th of February; it might not have been done till the

1st of May, for any thing Mr. Rose knew; he was not a party to it.—These are the circumstances of the case as it affects Mr. Rose. If he had at the time foreseen the attempt that would be made to implicate him in the transaction, he could hardly have acted with more caution and circumspection on a disclosure of a business which, as stated by the Accountant of the Pay Office (when reproved by Mr. Rose) had nothing criminal in it: M. Steele's statement too led to a belief, *that he had taken on himself a most severe responsibility, but to no suspicion of any thing beyond that.* The charge against government for dissolving parliament to prevent the investigation of the whole matter by the committee of finance, hardly deserves serious refutation. What particular inducement had the present ministers to protect Mr. Steele? When the occurrence took place, Lord Grenville, Lord Spencer, and Mr. Windham were in the cabinet; few of the present ministers were. Mr. Steele adhered to Mr. Addington after his separation from Mr. Pitt; and the latter, when he returned to the administration, removed Mr. Steele from his office. How then, it may be asked, *does any thing done by Mr. Steele affect the present Ministers?* The entire separation of Mr. Rose from him would have made it a very painful task for Mr. Rose to have become AN INFORMER against him when he no longer had a duty imposed on him to put himself in that situation.”—Now, Gentlemen, stripping this statement of all its quibbling and shuffling, the facts, as acknowledged by this defender of Mr. Rose, are these: 1st, that Mr. Rose was, on the 10th of February, 1806, he being still paymaster-general, made officially acquainted with an embezzlement of his predecessor, Mr. Steele (Pitt's favourite, “Tommy Steele”), to the amount of 19,000 pounds of the public money; 2nd, that Mr. Rose, then, and all the while since a member of the House of Commons, did not make any report of such embezzlement to the succeeding paymaster, nor any minute of it in the records of the office, nor any motion respecting it in the House of Commons; 3rd, that the embezzlement was discovered by Lord Temple, one of the succeeding paymasters-general, in January last; and, 4th, that the facts, having been communicated by Lord Temple to a committee of the late House of Commons, that committee was about to present a report upon the subject, when the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, the moment the

reading of prayers was over, and before the House could possibly proceed to business, brought a summons for the House to proceed to the House of Peers, where they heard a speech, which, at once, put an end to the report, the committee and the parliament.—In Mr. Rose's defence, it is, by the above writer, alledged, that he was *out of office* at the time when he received information upon the subject. This allegation, however, he is obliged to retract, for, it appears, that the new paymaster was not appointed, that is to say, did not enter upon the exercise of his functions, until the 24th of February, whereas it is expressly acknowledged, that the information was given to Mr. Rose on the 10th of that month. "Yes," says this defender, "but Mr. Rose did *not know* that. He *"looked upon himself as being out of office on the 10th,"* and as a proof of this, he states that Mr. Rose "went off to Buckden on the 11th."—Gentlemen, what a sorry shuffle is this? *Not know* that his official duties had not expired! *Not know* the time, *not know* the day and the hour, when duties expired, for the performance of which duties he received, out of our hard strained purses, 4,000 pounds a year! This fact, if true, would tend to shew us, with what degree of care and diligence such offices are executed. He "went off to Buckden." But, *why* did he go off to Buckden, and what, too, observe, the very next day? Why did he run out of the way the moment he had heard of so important a matter? He *thought* he was *out of office*, though he has received the salary for that office up to the 24th of the month, I dare engage. Yes, he might *possibly* think so: but, in such a case, it appears to me, that any man, worthy of such a place of trust, and so situated, would have wished to be able to probe the matter to the bottom, and to expose the embezzlement; and, that wish would naturally have led to an *inquiry* as to his official power of acting. Such a man would have said "let me see: my power as paymaster still remains; no successor has been actually appointed; I am yet able to bring this embezzler forth before I leave the office, or, at least, to put the facts upon record, so that my successor may be enabled to proceed upon the business, and to cause justice to be done to the public without delay." What man, worthy of high public trust, would not thus have thought, and have acted accordingly? When we complain of the enormous salaries that we are compelled to pay to men in such offices, and alledge, that their labours are nothing at all, we

are reminded of the great *responsibility*, the dreadful load of *care*, which, for our good, they take upon themselves; but, how has this been proved in the instance before us? Mr. Rose makes no discovery of the embezzlement, though he is two years in the office, and receives 8,000 pounds from us; and, when the discovery is made to him, he does not take the pains to ascertain whether he be still paymaster, or not, but goes off to the country as fast as post-horses can get along.—Nor, were we to admit of this miserable shuffle, that he did *not know* that he was still in office, would that admission at all diminish the blame imputable to him, if the facts, above stated by his defender, be correct; for, in the first place, it was his duty, his bounden duty, to have gone immediately to his successor, instead of going to Buckden, and to inform him of the facts, which had come to his knowledge. "My power, as pay-master," he would have said, "has expired; I am unable, officially, to make any record of this embezzlement; but, I am come to enable you to obtain, without delay, justice for that injured people, from whom I and my family have received so much money, that it would be ingratitude black as hell in me, were I, for one moment, to wink at any frauds committed upon them, burdened and oppressed as they already are." But, in lieu of this, which, I trust, would have been the conduct of either of you, Gentlemen, had you been in Mr. Rose's place, what does he do? He sets off instantly for Buckden, whence, however, he *writes* upon the subject; but, not to his successor in office, not to the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury; no, nor to any person or persons having power to obtain justice for the public, but to *Mr. Tommy Steele himself!* To *this person* alone he confines his communications upon the subject; and, upon Steele's telling him, that he would *explain* the matter to Lord Grenville, he, we are told, becomes, "*without hearing any thing more of the matter*, CONVINCED that a *satisfactory* explanation "has been given to Lord Grenville!" A *satisfactory* explanation of the withdrawing of 19,000 pounds of the public money from the service of the public, in direct violation of the law! God Almighty! Was there ever a nation so pillaged and so insulted as this! And is it, indeed, for the honor of fattening, with the sweat of our brow and the straining of our sinews, Tommy Steele and his like, that we are to, "spend our last shilling, and shed the last drop of our blood?"—Supposing, merely for the ar-

Summer
office,
he was
strain
such w
suppos
would
mora
with t
comm
my ne
cash o
know
charge
conniv
law de
and ju
if this
ment,
what i
ded a
conniv
ment
genero
means
is to n
ther,
"dian
solemn
with f
of you
ber o
maine
ary 1
witho
transa
know
been u
than
ment,
imme
By wa
ted, b
was,
made
with
ted b
from
Steele
in ad
man,
will e
staten
from
preve
Mr. A
after
his a
from
who
Pitt,

gentleman's sake, that the being out of the office, or, rather, the mere thinking that he was out of the office, and supposing, to strain the hypothesis to the utmost, that such was the real thought of Mr. Rose; supposing all this, what sort of apology would the like of this be, if viewed in a moral or even legal light, and compared with the maxims and practice of men in the common concerns of life? If I know that my neighbour's servant has purloined his cash or his plate, and do not make the fact known to my neighbour, I am manifestly chargeable with moral guilt, and, if my connivance be discovered and proved, the law deems me an accessory after the fact, and justly punishes me accordingly. And, if this be so in the case of an embezzlement, committed upon my neighbour, what is the judgment that ought to be awarded against me, if I am guilty of similar connivance, in the case of an embezzlement of the property of my master; my generous and confiding master, from whose means I have grown rich, and whose purse is to me still a source of riches? Nay, further, if I am, too, still one of "*the Guardians of this master's purse*," and have solemnly pledged myself to execute that trust with fidelity and diligence? Could either of you, Gentlemen, had you been a member of the House of Commons, have remained in that post from the 10th of February 1806, until the end of April, 1807, without making any motion relative to the transaction in question, had it come to your knowledge? I trust not; and, had there been upon Mr. Rose no other responsibility than merely that of a member of parliament, that alone demanded, on his part, an immediate exposure of the transaction.—By way of palliation, as to *motive*, it is stated, by the defender of Mr. Rose, that he was, at the time when the discovery was made to him, not in habits of intimacy with Steele, and that they had been separated by the separation of Mr. Addington from Mr. Pitt, to the former of whom Steele adhered, while Mr. Rose remained in adherence to Mr. Pitt. But, Gentleman, a very slight effort of the memory will enable us to set a proper value upon this statement. Mr. Rose was not so separated from the friends of Mr. Addington as to be prevented from joining with them and with Mr. Addington himself, in December 1804, after the first separation took place; nor has his attachment to Mr. Pitt prevented him from now embracing the Duke of Portland, who remained, like Steele, separated from Pitt, till the day of the death of the latter.

Separated! No, Gentlemen, such men are never separated as far as concerns transactions like that of which we are speaking. They may find it convenient, now-and-then, to affect being separated, and, sometimes, they may have their quarrels for place and emolument; but, as towards us, they are always firmly united, and are always found ready to stand by each other.—Denying that the dissolution of parliament had, for one of its objects, the protection of Steele, the writer, above-quoted, asks, "what particular inducement had the present ministers to protect Mr. Steele?" No particular inducement, perhaps, but, I can easily suppose a general inducement, and that it was powerful with them I have no doubt. As to the circumstance of Lords Grenville and Spencer and Mr. Windham being in the cabinet, at the time when the embezzlement took place, namely, in 1798 and 1800, that is a most foul insinuation against those gentlemen, because it is well known, that the two former were in offices not at all connected with the disbursement of the public money, and, it is, by this writer, declared, that the 19,000 pounds were withdrawn without the knowledge of the secretary at war, and Mr. Windham was that secretary at war. They were all, indeed, in the cabinet, but, we have seen that Pitt, being first Lord of the Treasury, could lend, of the public money, without interest, 40,000 pounds to Boyd and Benfield, two of his then majority in parliament, without consulting the cabinet, without ever making the fact known to any member thereof, without making any minute of it; and, has any body ever dreamed of making the cabinet responsible for that violation of the law? But, Gentlemen, though it is pretty certain, that Lords Grenville and Spencer and Mr. Windham were not privy to the embezzlement, it is by no means certain that some other persons, and those, perhaps, now in place, were not privy to it; this is by no means certain; and, therefore, it is not at all difficult to conceive a powerful motive for endeavouring to stifle the inquiry, which, as in the case of Lord Melville, would, in all likelihood, have led to further exposure, and would have implicated many persons, who naturally enough prefer the signal of "No Popery" to "No Peculation." Whether, however, the stifling of this inquiry was, or was not, a principal motive for dissolving the parliament, will soon become evident, when the new parliament has met. If the committee of finance be renewed, and composed of the same persons as nearly as possible as the last committee was composed of, then

I shall be ready to allow, that the stifling of the inquiry was *not* a principal object of the dissolution; but, if the committee be not renewed, or, being renewed, be not so composed, I shall be convinced that to stifle the inquiry *was* a principal object in making what Mr. Canning calls "an appeal to the people."—Our writer again reminds the public, that the late ministers had been in possession of the facts relating to Steele's embezzlement for several months previous to the time when they were bringing those facts out to light, and he infers, that they would never have brought them out, *had they remained in place*. This I believe; and this, Gentlemen, conveys a strong censure on the late ministers; but, it does not alter the case with respect to Mr. Rose or any of his party. It implicates two ministries instead of one in the charge of connivance; but, it lessens the blame due to neither, while it aggravates the grievance of the suffering people.—Were I to judge from the language of the defender of Mr. Rose, I should certainly anticipate a resolute endeavour, on the part of the new ministry, to stifle the inquiry in question. He calls the act of Steele an *irregularity*; he says that Mr. Rose saw nothing *criminal* in it; he talks of his being *justified* in taking so serious a *responsibility* upon himself; he talks of his having done *nothing more* than taking upon himself a *responsibility*; and he calls him a gentleman *universally beloved*! This is pretty language; pretty cant! The robber upon the highway *only* takes upon himself a severe responsibility. The murderer does no more. But, they are both hanged, if caught. Let us hope, at any rate, that we shall be favoured with the *name* of "the person to whom the money was given for *secret services*." Let us hope, too (though that, perhaps, is too much to hope) that we shall know the *nature* of the *services*. But, Gentlemen, how infamously impudent it is to talk of *services* in such a case! What services could *possibly* be furthered by the misapplication of this money? What else than an injury to the country could possibly be effected by the employment of 10,000 pounds of its money for purposes that *dared not be avowed*, and that have been kept secret from 1798 to the present day?—When we see such things brought to light, what must we think of the magnitude of the peculations that remain hidden? Oh, that the day were arrived, when the whole mystery of iniquity shall be developed! In that day, when it comes, and come it will; in that day, when, to use the words

of Sir Francis Burdett, "corruption shall have destroyed corruption," we shall clearly see how we have been beggared, what has produced the income-tax, and what all the enormous burdens we bear; but, until that day comes, expect no good, I pray you, except in the way of *exposure*, from any human being, and much less from the apostate Whigs, who, while the prospect of long enjoyment of place lay before them, extolled the character and conduct of Pitt, and walked in all his footsteps, but particularly in those which tended to the screening of speculators, many of whom they saw clearly detected, but not one of whom did they punish, or cause to disgorge his plunder.

Another topic, which I wish to address you upon, is the election in general, of which, however, after your reading of the advertisements, which I have taken for my motto, it will be useless to say much. And *this*, Gentlemen, is what they call "an appeal to the people!" This is the mighty blessing, which, we are told, the world envy us! From one corner of the kingdom to the other corruption extends his baleful, his serpent hatching wings. Can this last? Ought it to last? Of what avail is it that the miscreants engaged in this infamous traffic call us jacobins and levellers? Will any one of them say, that this ought to be? Has any one of them the ingenuity to find out any thing, even in imagination, worse than this? Politicians may endeavour to alarm us with cries of revolution, and divines may preach to us about hell; but, if the one can find any thing more disgraceful, or the other any thing more damnable, than what is described in these advertisements, I beseech them speedily to exhibit it to our view. *Fifty-seven* of these advertisements have I read in the London daily papers; and, I defy any man living to produce me, in the history of the whole world, any thing so completely descriptive of national degradation. Well may Mr. Fawkes say, in his address to his late constituents of the county of York, that a seat in parliament, which he once regarded as the height of laudable ambition, he now views in quite a different light; and, the only wonder is, that he should have been till now in the dark upon the subject. Again I call upon our accusers, upon those, who, for hire, denominate us jacobins and levellers, and who cry aloud for the preservation of the constitution, to say, whether the constitution sanctions these things. If it does, what an infamous imposture it is! and, if it does not, it is we, and not our revilers, who are endeavouring to support the constitution of

England. Aye, it is we who would restore and support the constitution; the real constitution; that constitution which so strictly forbids the buying or the selling of a single vote, much more a seat in parliament; that constitution which inhibits peers from any sort of interference in elections, and that supposes it impossible that any peer should, in any way, send a member to the Commons' House; that constitution, in short, which forbids, in the strongest terms, and under severe penalties, every one of the abuses, of which we complain; and yet have the hireling revilers the audacity to reproach us with *a wish to overturn the constitution!* In such a state the country cannot long remain. No country has ever long remained in such a state. Those who have an evident interest in perpetuating abuses of all sorts, may endeavour to terrify the people with the consequences of what is called a revolution; and, from a revolution, in the usual sense of the word, as applied to politics, God preserve us! but a *change*, and a great change too, must come, and come it will, in one way or another, and that at no distant day.

I should here make some remarks upon the baseness of those, who have, at a time like this, set up a cry of "*No Popery.*" Mr. Perceval, *may* be, and for the honour of human nature, I hope he is, sincere in his alarms upon this score; but, as to the rest of the ministry, if they have had any hand in setting up this cry, while, at the same time, it is well known that they approved of the measures contemplated by Pitt, they must be the very basest of all mankind. I am inclined to expect, or to hope, little good from them; but, really, to impute such baseness to them, without positive proof, I cannot. Of all sins that of political hypocrisy excites the greatest degree of public hatred; and, if it should appear, that it is they who, while they have not dared to avow it openly, have thus set to work the mercenaries of the press and the pulpit, they will see the day when a terrible vengeance will fall upon their heads. On this subject, I beg leave to refer you to the excellent Letter of Lord Grenville, contained in the present sheet, reserving my remarks upon it for another opportunity, but availing myself of this opportunity just to remind his Lordship, that there are other Societies besides *Corresponding Societies* capable of carrying on the work of "*sedition,*" and that, the trick of "*no popery,*" in 1807, is very little, if any, worse, or more base, than the trick of "*chartered rights,*" in 1784. His Lordship seems to have been paid off in his own coin, or, perhaps, in the coin of his admired

Pitt; but, the unhappy Whigs, have, owing to their own cupidity in the last instance, been over-reached in both cases.

Now, as to your *own election*, Gentlemen, it will, perhaps, be too late to offer you any thing in the way of advice; but, I cannot refrain from thus publicly expressing my deep regret, that Mr. Paull is no longer in a state to be thought of as your representative, and more particularly that the cause of his incapacity should also have endangered his life; a life, which, from the time that I had the honour first to know him, I knew to have been ardently and disinterestedly devoted to the public. His conduct, in some instances, may have been precipitate, rash, violent; but, these are faults not of the worst stamp, and they are greatly overbalanced by his public virtues. Of those virtues, the exercise of which I have witnessed, I am sorry the country will now be deprived; but, in the consciousness of possessing them, he will, I hope, find more than a sufficient consolation for any disappointment that he may, at present, have experienced. Mr. Paull was first known to me through the means of Mr. Windham, in June, 1805. From that time to the close of the last Westminster election, I was privy to all his public proceedings, and, I think to all his motives; and, I am convinced, that all those proceedings flowed from a desire to render good to his country. He withstood temptations such as no other man, that I know of, ever withstood. There is nothing, in reason, that he might not have possessed, in the way of what is called honour, and what really is profit, if he would have desisted from the performance of what he regarded as his public duty. This I know; for this I honour him; for this I shall always rejoice at his good fortune, and mourn whatever of bad shall befall him.—Sir Francis Burdett I have, from the time of the second Middlesex election, regarded as the fittest man to represent you, an opinion to which Mr. Paull is no stranger, and, I am persuaded, that the latter would, at any time, have resigned all pretensions in favour of the former. That you will, at this late hour, succeed in electing Sir Francis Burdett; he being absent too, I can hardly expect, though I most anxiously hope it; for, until his principles, which are the real principles of the constitution, prevail, neither happiness nor liberty, nor one moment's safety from without, will this our harrassed and distracted country enjoy.—With respect to Lord Cochrane, excepting solely his being an officer appointed by, and liable, at any hour, to be promoted or cashiered by the king or,

rather, his ministers, to him I have no objection; but, on the contrary, I have the highest opinion both of his head and his heart. He has a solid understanding, has much of the right sort of study, reflects deeply, is sober, industrious, politically brave, is proof against the blandishments of courts and of factions, hates sycophants, place-hunters, peculators, and oppressors of every description; and, if he should be elected, by you especially, I venture to predict that he will zealously discharge his trust. That your choice may fall upon him and Sir Francis Burdett is my anxious wish, and, let what will be the result of your present arduous endeavours, be assured, that for all and for every man of you a sincere respect will ever be entertained by

Your faithful friend,
And obedient servant,
WM. COBBETT.

Botley, 7th May, 1807.

LORD GRENVILLE'S LETTER, to the Secretary of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Dated 2d May, 1807.

SIR,—The society for promoting Christian Knowledge, of which I am a member, has thought fit to publish, during a general election, a resolution, declaratory of its opinion respecting a political measure recently submitted to parliament.—That measure, brought forward for purposes of peace, union, and public security, by men who yield to none of their fellow-subjects in loyalty to their sovereign, and attachment to the civil and religious constitution of their country, is there stigmatised as hostile to the established church and ecclesiastical constitution of the realm, and as subversive of those principles which placed his Majesty's family on the British throne.—It is natural for those whose characters are thus aspersed, to inquire, by what right any persons have taken upon themselves, in the name of such a society, to give countenance and currency to an injurious and groundless calumny, calculated for the watch-word of a party, and calculated only to excite and to uphold popular clamour?—The society was instituted, as its annual publications declare, for the increase of the knowledge and practice of our holy religion, by the support of charity schools, and by the distribution of bibles, prayer-books, and other religious tracts. Those who have directed the present proceeding can best explain in what manner Christian knowledge, or Christian practice, will be increased by promoting religious animosities and civil discord: by stirring up the blind prejudices and ungovernable pas-

sions of the ignorant: and by circulating among our fellow-subjects, instead of the Word of truth and charity, the libellous and inflammatory calumnies of electioneering contests, and party violence.—As a member of the society, solicitous for the promotion of its genuine objects, I desire to enter my dissent to a resolution purporting to express its unanimous opinion. I object to the propriety of its taking part at all in the political divisions of the country: I object to its labouring to extend and to prolong those divisions, with respect to a measure publicly withdrawn, and of which there is consequently no longer any question: But, most of all, I object to the truth, and, I may add, to the decency of a censure, which, if it were founded either in justice or in reason, would apply equally to almost every description of public men, and would even implicate all those authorities which are the most entitled to our respect and reverence.—If to permit the King's subjects of all persuasions, to serve him in his army, be "an unconstitutional innovation," with whom, and when did it originate? It was first made the law in Ireland fourteen years ago, at the express recommendation of the crown, delivered from the throne by one of his Majesty's present ministers, then Lord Lieutenant of that kingdom.—If the adoption of a similar law in Great Britain would be "an act of hostility to the established church," to whom shall that hostility be ascribed? To those who now proposed, or to those who long ago engaged for that concession? To the framers of Lord Howick's bill, or to those members and supporters of the present government, who in the year 1793, gave and authorised that promise to the Catholics of Ireland?—If the employment of catholic officers and catholic soldiers in the general service of the empire; if the permitting them to hold and exercise, at his Majesty's discretion, all military commissions, the rank and station of a general not excepted; if the relieving them in this respect from all penalties and disabilities on account of their religious persuasion;—if these things be matter of just alarm "to the ecclesiastical constitution of this country," when was the moment of alarm? In the year 1804, all this, and more than this, was done in an act proposed by Mr. Pitt, with the concurrence of his colleagues now in administration, passed by the British parliament, and sanctioned by his Majesty's royal assent.—That act legalised a long list of military commissions, antecedently granted by his Majesty with the advice of the same ministers; and it enabled his Majesty prospectively to grant,

at his
whate
or Iris
to me
and w
those
of the
—Wh
remain
again
were p
honou
dange
countr
that th
promi
were
dissen
judged
jects
tion,
which
to for
tions
conce
sive o
Majes
what
indulg
minist
alread
also s
and of
chy?
this u
what
serve,
tende
call to
partis
plan;
now
yond
these
stigm
ments
to libe
to cal
pute
racter
dead,
them
tenor
consi
nant
to ma
the c
nstit
I h

at his discretion, all military commissions whatever to Catholics—not indeed to British or Irish Catholics, but to foreign Catholics—to men who owe his Majesty no allegiance, and who are not even required to disclaim those tenets which all our fellow subjects of that persuasion have solemnly abjured!—What ground of difference will then remain to justify these outrageous calumnies against the late proposal? Is it that men were permitted to aspire to the rewards and honours of a profession, to the toils and dangers of which the legislature of their country had long since invited them?—Is it that the same indulgences which had been promised and granted to Catholics by others, were not withheld by us from Protestant dissenters?—Or is it, lastly, that we judged our own countrymen and fellow-subjects entitled, under his Majesty's discretion, to the same confidence and favour which parliament had so recently extended to foreigners of all nations and all descriptions?—And let me further ask, if these concessions, all, or any of them, are subversive of the principles “which placed his Majesty's illustrious house upon the throne,” what is to be said of the far more extensive indulgences proposed in 1801, by that great minister, now no more, whose name I have already mentioned?—Were his principles also subversive of the established church, and of the civil constitution of the monarchy?—And if he too must be involved in this indiscriminating and injurious censure, what condemnation will not those men deserve, who, in the very moment of pretended danger, have advised his Majesty to call to his present councils, the authors, the partisans, and the supporters of Mr. Pitt's plan; a plan including all that has been now proposed, and extending very far beyond our measure?—On the expediency of these measures, statesmen may differ. To stigmatize them as hostile to our establishments, or dangerous to our constitution, is to libel both the throne and the parliament—to calumniate the existing laws—and to impute to the most considerable public characters of our age, both the living and the dead, principles and purposes disclaimed by themselves, and contradicted by the whole tenor of their lives. It is for the society to consider whether such a conduct be consonant to the character which it befits them to maintain, or in any manner conducive to the objects of a charitable and religious institution.

I have the honour to be, &c. &c.

GRENVILLE.

MAJOR CARTWRIGHT'S ADDRESS

To the Electors of Boston.

GENTLEMEN,—As you are now again about to exercise the high public trust reposed in your hands—that of electing a part of the legislature of your country; and as I have once more tendered you my services to represent you in parliament, it is my desire, at this eventful crisis of England, to address to you my sentiments on public affairs.—No member of the present House of Commons—Members of which have been alert enough in obtaining good things for themselves—having attempted to obtain for the people either of those securities, against foreign conquest, or domestic oppression, which were noticed in my addresses to you of November last, namely, a restoration of the military branch of the constitution, and a reformed representation of the people in parliament, my motives for desiring a seat in that House have acquired additional force.—This restoration and this reform are, on the part of the people of England, birthright claims. To the violation of these essential rights, ought chiefly, if not wholly, to be ascribed, both the late and the present war, together with all the grievous burthens they have brought upon us, and the unexampled dangers of our present situation; and without the recovery of these rights—Rights of which political salvation are the direct objects—it requires but a moderate share of information to know, that, in the day of trial, no human genius, no human efforts, will be found equal to the task of saving the state: for who can produce an effect, without the necessary means as a cause?—How distant that day of trial may be, we know not: but another carnage in Poland—an event that will probably take place as soon as artillery can act with full effect—may, and I incline to believe will, bring it very near indeed. With such an alternative hanging on the trembling balance of war, while our rulers are engaged in the miserable warfare of party and private ambition, for the parliament and the ministers of this country to suffer it to remain comparatively defenceless as it is: as well as to neglect those reforms, military and civil, which are wanting for inspiring the people with confidence, as well as with a rational, heart-felt, ardent attachment to the government, on account of its truly constitutional character, its known respect for our liberties, and its vigilant protection of our properties against unnecessary taxation, and the rapacity of sordid men; appears to me, I confess, nothing short of that species of infatuation, which is ever observed to dark-

en the understanding, and to palsy the energies, of a state, on the eve of its destruction: but sincerity requires I should add, that the people have a part to act, and a duty to perform; and when they fail in their own fidelity to their country, it is with an ill grace they murmur at the misdoings of others; or complain that taxgatherers swarm like locusts, with devouring exactions and irritating vexations in their train. In proportion as parliaments, or as ministers, at any time depart from the straight line of the constitution, or assume improper powers, the exertions of the people, in their own self defence, become necessary for correcting the error, and restoring the balance.—According to my plain view of things, the more our country, by the purity, the excellence, and the beneficence of its government, shall be rendered worth defending, the better it will be defended; and the more the sword shall be in the hand of an English people, the more secure will be an English throne, from the fate which has attended the thrones of Sardinia and Naples, of Austria and Prussia; whose several despotic possessors had not only disarmed their people, but had likewise beggared them for the maintenance of standing armies to keep them in a state of abject slavery. The effects of this abominable policy we have witnessed; for we have seen that, in the hour of necessity, those standing armies could not protect either the people who paid them, or the tyrants who employed them. This fatal policy of standing armies,—wicked in the extreme in respect of our liberties, and stupid in the extreme in respect to our defence—a policy in which all modern ministers, and for reasons which are but too obvious, have rivalled each other to establish and to perfect—I, as a private individual have, I trust, exposed to the contempt and just detestation of the reflecting and the virtuous.—On facts, and on reasoning which no soldier, no seaman, no statesman, has yet attempted to refute, but in which some of high name have agreed with me, I gave proof, as I conceive, that England, notwithstanding her navy, may, in her present ill-preparedness by land, be invaded; and that in the event of the enemy landing in force, the mischief and calamity of having our country the seat of war, would be certain; while we, after our recent experience on the continent, should have but too much cause to contemplate even the possibility of a conquest. This, Gentlemen, is not an impeachment of English courage: but it is, and I mean it to be, an impeachment of the conduct of those who, on a continental, tyrannical policy, abhorrent to the character and temper of our free government, design-

edly crippled that courage, or, to speak without a figure, withheld from it the means of conferring on our country an assured protection, and the blessings of a peace which not even a Buonaparté would have dared to disturb. Such a protection, and such a peace, will still result from the reforms for which I contend, if they be not too long deferred.—Should the tyrannical policy, to which I allude, bring into the bowels of our country the pest of war, with all its scorpion plagues, what punishment could be sufficiently great, for those whose counsels should have been the cause! But, should England be conquered, you ought to be aware, that her slavery would be made more degrading, and her misery more extreme, exceeding all comparison, beyond what French insolence and pillage have inflicted on any other fallen people. To the conquest of Italians and Germans, a mere ambition unmixed with national enmity was a sufficient motive; but the stimulus to the conquest of Englishmen, to say nothing of the greater glory from the greatness of the enterprise, is the maddening remembrance of centuries of our superiority over Frenchmen in arms, causing a deep rooted and deadly revenge on the part of that nation, besides a hatred in the breast of its ruler, which nought but our subjugation, can appease.—Should the genius of this man prevail in Poland,—and I see nothing to forbid the expectation—who can calculate the change it may effect in our northern alliances? Who, in such an event, can say, that the Czar of Muscovy may not, by temptations of aggrandizement in the East, become the active ally of the Corsican, and his co-partner in the spoil of nations? Who can assure us, that the rich provinces of devoted Turkey,—a prey for which her northern neighbour has long manifested the keenest appetite—together with a division of booty, on a joint expedition to the golden regions beyond the Indus, may not purchase a quarrel with England, and a hearty co-operation with France, in her long-meditated and favourite project of invasion? And who does not see that, in such a case, every state upon the continent must join the confederacy, with all the forces the two presiding emperors should please to command; whereby a million of soldiers at least might be brought against us, by enemies in possession of every thing maritime, throughout the whole of continental Europe; to which the Turkish navy might at their pleasure be added? These, Gentlemen, are considerations, on which you may do well to reflect; as from your local situation, yours it is likely to be, to have the first taste of formidable invasion; for which, you

but too the sh time w the att gestio cessive for the acqui judge —Con that is requir from sendin or that but, w be th be, to this I your tion, t its pr be br tion. I do r and th ture, the w seeing mercy posed troniz strife sively forml instea tious ple; stead deper sible How bals, rewar sionin ing, natur at the who you. tative impl politi for y and have even when the Wis galli thou

but too well know, that your coast has not the shadow of a preparation. Since the time when, to this particular circumstance the attention of government was, at my suggestion in 1803, particularly called, four successive administrations have been responsible for the nation's defence; and how they have acquitted themselves of that duty, you may judge by what you see with your own eyes.—Considering, Gentlemen, both the good that is necessary to be done, and the ill that requires to be undone, I am very far indeed from pretending, or presuming, that, by sending me to parliament, your condition, or that of your country, would be improved: but, when the state is in danger, I hold it to be the duty of every man, feeble as he may be, to do his best for its preservation; and this I can undertake, that, should I become your representative, your country's condition, together with those reforms which are its proper remedies, should unquestionable be brought under parliamentary consideration. You would then at least have—what I do not at present see—a chance of redress; and the possibility of a government in future, in conformity with the principles and the wisdom of the constitution; instead of seeing your abused country for ever at the mercy of this party, or of that party, composed of combining great men with their patronized adventurers at their heels, as, in the strife of ambition and avarice, they successively rise to power; governing but too uniformly, by their own capricious discretion, instead of constitutional law, by a presumptuous expediency instead of political principle; or by a time-serving sycophancy, instead of the loftiness of thought, and the independency of action, becoming the responsible statesmen of a great and free nation. How all alike strive to strengthen their cabals, by aggrandizing their own families, by rewarding their personal adherents, by pensioning their own servants, and by discharging, in short, all obligations, of a personal nature, and all the debts of private gratitude, at the public expence, that is, at our cost who pay the taxes, I need not point out to you. If, Gentlemen, you wanted representatives who should be strictly devoted to, and implicitly governed by, the opinions of any political leaders, I certainly should not be fit for your service; for I ever have reprobated, and ever shall, any such subserviency; and have ever been in the habit of expostulating even with the statesmen I most respected, whenever I have seen them swerving from the straight line of constitutional duty. Wishing to strike off from my country the galling shackles of party, I have always thought it did not become me to wear them.

—As oft as the case of the people's liberties can be fairly brought before parliament, which is a solemn, and the most effectual mode of bringing it before the nation, ground must always be gained. It is a question which must acquire strength by discussion, and thrive in the light. It cannot be discussed too often, or too much. It is sound to the heart, and will bear handling. It can only sicken when kept in the dark, while the attention of the people is artfully diverted to the wranglings of faction, on objects which, in truth, little concern them, until they shall have recovered their own proper weight in the government.—Have we not recently seen, what has been done by perseverance in the cause of the friendless Africans, nations of another colour and another zone, naked and helpless, and in the most wretched of human conditions,—nations which had not in the English parliament a single representative? But truth, and justice, and the fear of God were on their side, and they have prevailed. Mighty were their oppressors; and interests, and combinations the most powerful, long continued their oppressions; but they found persevering advocates, and the consciousness of parliament finally crowned those advocates with an easy victory. How much more, then, must that consciousness avail, when the cause of the people of England shall be perseveringly pleaded in the ear of parliament? Of that people, whom this parliament—I am speaking of the House of Commons—knows that it ought to represent; that for the service of that people it was created; that to do their work, and for no other cause, it wholly exists; and on whose public opinion, whenever it shall be steadily fixed on its object, it knows it must defend!—Be, therefore, of good cheer, in the hope of better days. We should be a nation of idiots, should not the unexampled and unheard-of pressure of English taxation induce serious reflection—should not the impossibility of stemming the tide of corruption by any weaker barrier than a reformed House of Commons, become the general conviction—should not the continually growing greatness of that gigantic power which still meditates invasion sink deep into our thoughts—should not the calamitous prospect of events to result from the war finding its way into the bowels of our country, arouse all our anxieties for prevention—and should we not see, and feel, and understand the necessity of arming our population according to the constitution, if we mean not to become slaves to the armed nation of France. On these points, our destiny hangs. On these points, a public opinion is daily and hourly growing up, and not slowly

advancing to maturity. What member of either House of Parliament can close his own mind against its entrance? can divest himself of its influence? or can arrest its course? Or what individual of those bodies, when the question, under the awful sanction of public opinion, shall come home to his bosom, shall be capable of opposing to the salvation of his country, his own little sordid, contemptible interests? No—Gentlemen, in the last crisis of a nation demanding freedom and defence, this could not be done. Here shall we see the first revisiting beam of genuine representation; for the consciousness of parliament will truly represent public opinion.—As a nation, our affairs have nearly run to the worst that can be, short of ruin and extinction: but having at the critical juncture cast from us that national wickedness and reproach, the slave trade, let us hope, if we persevere in rectitude, and pursue reform according to the principles of our constitution, which accord with the laws of nature and of God, that by his providence we and our cause shall not be cast off; but that our affairs taking a happy turn, our liberties and our happiness may be replaced on their proper basis.—To be an humble instrument for such ends is all my ambition. Weak instruments, in designs supported by public opinion and the favour of Providence may be employed with success in breaking down the loftiest barriers of wrong, and in building up the strongest bulwarks of right.—Although, Gentlemen, I cannot insult you, nor dishonour myself by unworthy acts or arts for securing an election, I have thought it right to canvas; because it is fit the electors should have an opportunity of taking pledges of candidates, for a faithful performance of duty, in case of becoming representatives.—On the nature of a canvas you already know my sentiments. I shall not therefore feel myself intitled to any vote unless at the time of polling, the party can then give it with a perfect consciousness of fulfilling to his country the sacred duty of an elector, in the choice of those who are to be law makers and guardians of the liberties of the nation.—The witty Doctor South, being of opinion that in covetousness there is as much folly as there is sin, tells the miser in one of his sermons, that 'tis bad economy to be damned to save charges. Now it is to be observed, that the money for which the miser runs his risk, he really gets; whereas I have heard of electors who, ever risking all the consequences of doing wrong are not likely to get the promised reward.—That you, on whomsoever your choice of representatives may at any time fall, may on all occasions secure to yourselves, by your

conduct, not only the inward satisfaction, but the praise of both integrity and wisdom, is the sincere prayer of, Gentlemen, your friend and well-wisher, JOHN CARTWRIGHT.
Tuesday, 28th April, 1807.

CHANGE OF MINISTRY.

Address to the Inhabitants of Southampton.

"Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri."

FELLOW CITIZENS,—We are invited by the Corporation of Southampton to join with them at this particular juncture in an Address to His Majesty, expressive of our "*grateful sense of the manifold blessings enjoyed under his auspicious government*;" which they have "*resolved*" to present, whether we join in those expressions or not. Now, fellow citizens, although the Mayor and Corporation be, as certainly they are, the fittest persons in this kingdom, perhaps in the world, to govern us, we may respectfully entertain a doubt whether they are equally fit to think for us, and to compose for us. Had the vessel of congratulation to His Majesty sailed only in ballast, or had she contained a cargo which a privileged bottom would justly neutralize, I for one would have suffered her to pass unmolested under the flag of loyalty, and would even have aided her course; but as her lading consists of an assortment of articles, fairly subjecting her to a scrutiny, and a demurrage, we will exercise the right of search, in a hasty page, before we suffer her to proceed on her voyage.—I need scarcely premise, that in presenting an address at THIS JUNCTURE, we authenticate our unqualified approbation of three great public measures,—that of the rejection of the petitions of the Catholics, that of the dismissal of the late Ministers, and the appointment of the present as their successors.—On the first: the policy of dissatisfying the Catholics is, at least, extremely equivocal, and the event may prove it very fatal. The wisdom of a proceeding of government may well be questioned, which, as it affects a large body of the people, diminishes their attachment to it, and extinguishes HOPE,—that PROPERTY which Providence has beneficently bestowed upon those of his creatures who have no other, and which is a substitute for all.—It might possibly not have been prudent to grant in toto the prayer of the Catholics of Ireland, or even to grant at present any part of it; but it is clearly imprudent to declare to a great mass of the nation labouring under disabilities, that the very question of removing them, however their loyalty may deserve it, SHALL NEVER BE AGAIN DISCUSSED!! Such an annunciation appears the more injurious, as the pretext for issuing it

of the manner of importance. We all know that one part of the withdrawn measure was to grant to the Catholics in this country, where, from their comparative fewness, they never can be dangerous, a security against penalties and prosecutions, from which they are exempted by law in Ireland, whence from their great comparative preponderance they might, if evil-disposed, be extremely dangerous. The other object of the measure was potent to do good, was calculated to animate honourable ambition and to confirm loyalty; but was absolutely innocent of any possible mischief: I mean the empowering officers to hold the situation of general on the staff, &c. with some other circumstances. But the former being of the most importance, and most anticipated danger, I will alone consider it. On this subject, fellow-citizens, it will be sufficient to observe, that a general officer, however distinguished for courage, talents, and patriotism, although he may have been fifty years a general, can alone be put on the staff by the special appointment of His Majesty; and who can, without assigning any reason, the next moment dismiss him from it. He can never attain it by merit, or seniority, or by any other means, but the King's appointment by which sole authority, persons, incredible as it may appear to us in this benign age, have been known in former reigns to be employed as generals on the staff, whose Christianity, courage, and talents, were never discerned but by the gracious monarch which appointed them. As officers then of a loyal army, they never could be dangerous to the government without the consent of the Crown; and it is obvious that a rebel Irish army would not look to a British act of parliament for the qualifications of its commanders. I can therefore see no predicament, whether loyal or rebellious, wherein the measure in question would have made the Catholics more dangerous than they are already. I discard this point with one question,—who are the persons whom we dismiss to secret and eternal discontent? are they three or four millions of our bravest population,—composing a vast proportion of the defenders of our country ACTUALLY IN ARMS!!—With regard to any real apprehension of danger to our religion on the part of the clergy, one cannot believe that they feel it; I mean the sensible part of them. The rage of catholic or protestant proselytism is, in this part of Europe at least, exploded; and as I am myself a sincere well-wisher to the established reformed church, I should be sorry to see the misplaced zeal of the clergy imputed by enemies to apprehensions of danger to their endowments rather

than to their doctrines.—The next topic is the dismissed ministry. We many of us, fellow-citizens, congratulated the country on their accession to power, because we regarded them as men pledged to capital measures of public freedom and utility. We must with proportionate sorrow have seen them abandon many of those measures; and public favour could not in any degree have left them, if they had not left their principles. In bringing forward the catholic claims, however, they brought forward a vitally important measure in redemption of one of their own solemn pledges; but this measure, thus brought forward, we had the regret to see them withdraw, out of an alleged but false delicacy to the prejudices and scruples of the Sovereign. Whereas we expected that men of a high sense of public honour would not have withdrawn their measure, but would have withdrawn themselves!—Yet it is singular, or ought to be so, and is certainly mortifying, to perceive, that the late ministry having flourished in the favour of the Crown, under many turns of forgiveness, should have been ostensibly dismissed for an attempt to maintain their consistency and their honour in the only grand political instance in which they appear to have recoiled. It is then on this account, that, though we may feel no high regret at their dismissal, we must regret, that this dismissal has been the consequence of an honourable and meritorious part of their conduct (whether wise or otherwise), and with this natural sentiment on seeing an act of honour and principle converted into an instrument for the punishment of its authors, we cannot creditably congratulate his Majesty upon it.—Lastly, fellow-citizens, there can be no question of the right of the King to change his ministers as often as his shirt, or his residence.—It is perhaps the only irresponsible (AND NECESSARILY IRRESPONSIBLE) political act, he can exercise; I say NECESSARILY, because, it is in fact, he can only exercise himself. And the attempt to bring his CONSTITUTIONAL PERSONAL EXERCISE of this right within the limits of an advised measure, is a pure factious sophism. It is the clear doctrine of the constitution, that the responsible adviser of the Crown must be an official one; and what official adviser can the King have to dismiss his ministers, unless his very ministers themselves? for no body else can give him responsible advice, until these are actually dismissed, and their successors are appointed; who consequently become his subsequent, but not his precedent advisers.—But however disgusted we may be with these factious contentions, in which our, the people's,

advancing to maturity. What member of either House of Parliament can close his own mind against its entrance? can divest himself of its influence? or can arrest its course? Or what individual of those bodies, when the question, under the awful sanction of public opinion, shall come home to his bosom, shall be capable of opposing to the salvation of his country, his own little sordid, contemptible interests? No—Gentlemen, in the last crisis of a nation demanding freedom and defence, this could not be done. Here shall we see the first revisiting beam of genuine representation; for the consciousness of parliament will truly represent public opinion.—As a nation, our affairs have nearly run to the worst that can be, short of ruin and extinction: but having at the critical juncture cast from us that national wickedness and reproach, the slave trade, let us hope, if we persevere in rectitude, and pursue reform according to the principles of our constitution, which accord with the laws of nature and of God, that by his providence we and our cause shall not be cast off; but that our affairs taking a happy turn, our liberties and our happiness may be replaced on their proper basis.—To be an humble instrument for such ends is all my ambition. Weak instruments, in designs supported by public opinion and the favour of Providence may be employed with success in breaking down the loftiest barriers of wrong, and in building up the strongest bulwarks of right.—Although, Gentlemen, I cannot insult you, nor dishonour myself by unworthy acts or arts for securing an election, I have thought it right to canvas; because it is fit the electors should have an opportunity of taking pledges of candidates, for a faithful performance of duty, in case of becoming representatives.—On the nature of a canvas you already know my sentiments. I shall not therefore feel myself intitled to any vote unless at the time of polling, the party can then give it with a perfect consciousness of fulfilling to his country the sacred duty of an elector, in the choice of those who are to be law makers and guardians of the liberties of the nation.—The witty Doctor South, being of opinion that in covetousness there is as much folly as there is sin, tells the miser in one of his sermons, that 'tis bad economy to be damned to save charges. Now it is to be observed, that the money for which the miser runs his risk, he really gets; whereas I have heard of electors who, ever risking all the consequences of doing wrong are not likely to get the promised reward.—That you, on whomsoever your choice of representatives may at any time fall, may on all occasions secure to yourselves, by your

conduct, not only the inward satisfaction, but the praise of both integrity and wisdom, is the sincere prayer of, Gentlemen, your friend and well-wisher, JOHN CARTWRIGHT.
Tuesday, 28th April, 1807.

CHANGE OF MINISTRY.

Address to the Inhabitants of Southampton.

"Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri."

FELLOW CITIZENS,—We are invited by the Corporation of Southampton to join with them at this particular juncture in an Address to His Majesty, expressive of our "*grateful sense of the manifold blessings enjoyed under his auspicious government*;" which they have "*resolved*" to present, whether we join in those expressions or not. Now, fellow citizens, although the Mayor and Corporation be, as certainly they are, the fittest persons in this kingdom, perhaps in the world, to govern us, we may respectfully entertain a doubt whether they are equally fit to think for us, and to compose for us. Had the vessel of congratulation to His Majesty sailed only in ballast, or had she contained a cargo which a privileged bottom would justly neutralize, I for one would have suffered her to pass unmolested under the flag of loyalty, and would even have aided her course; but as her lading consists of an assortment of articles, fairly subjecting her to a scrutiny, and a demurrage, we will exercise the right of search, in a hasty page, before we suffer her to proceed on her voyage.—I need scarcely premise, that in presenting an address at THIS JUNCTURE, we authenticate our unqualified approbation of three great public measures,—that of the rejection of the petitions of the Catholics, that of the dismissal of the late Ministers, and the appointment of the present as their successors.—On the first: the policy of dissatisfying the Catholics is, at least, extremely equivocal, and the event may prove it very fatal. The wisdom of a proceeding of government may well be questioned, which, as it affects a large body of the people, diminishes their attachment to it, and extinguishes HOPE,—that PROPERTY which Providence has beneficently bestowed upon those of his creatures who have no other, and which is a substitute for all.—It might possibly not have been prudent to grant in toto the prayer of the Catholics of Ireland, or even to grant at present any part of it; but it is clearly imprudent to declare to a great mass of the nation labouring under disabilities, that the very question of removing them, however their loyalty may deserve it, SHALL NEVER BE AGAIN DISCUSSED!! Such an annunciation appears the more injurious, as the pretext for issuing it

849]
was of
know
sure w
count
ness,
again
which
where
ponde
extrem
the m
culate
to con
poten
empon
gener
vil dis
most
ger, I
ject,
observ
tingui
TANT
years
by th
and v
the n
can n
by an
ment
credi
nign
to be
whos
were
mind
then
dang
conse
a REL
fish a
its c
predi
when
made
they
one c
we d
are t
popu
the d
ARM
hens
of th
feel
The
tism
plod
wish
shou
the
sion

was of no manner of importance. We all know that one part of the withdrawn measure was to grant to the Catholics in this country, where, from their comparative fewness, they never can be dangerous, a security against penalties and prosecutions, from which they are exempted by law in Ireland, wherein from their great comparative preponderance they might, if evil-disposed, be extremely dangerous. The other object of the measure was potent to do good, was calculated to animate honourable ambition and to confirm loyalty; but was absolutely impotent of any possible mischief: I mean the empowering officers to hold the situation of general on the staff, &c. with some other civil distinctions. But the former being of the most importance, and most anticipated danger, I will alone consider it. On this subject, fellow citizens, it will be sufficient to observe, that a general officer, however distinguished for courage, talents, and PROTESTANTISM, although he may have been fifty years a general, can alone be put on the staff by the special appointment of His Majesty, and who can, without assigning any reason, the next moment dismiss him from it. He can never attain it by merit, or seniority, or by any other means, but the King's appointment: by which sole authority, persons, incredible as it may appear to us in this benign one, have been known in former reigns to be employed as generals on the staff, whose Christianity, courage, and talents, were never discerned but by the gracious mind which appointed them. As officers then of a LOYAL army, they never could be dangerous to the government, without the consent of the Crown, and it is obvious that a REBEL Irish army would not look to a British act of parliament for the qualifications of its commanders. I can therefore see no predicament, whether loyal or rebellious, wherein the measure in question would have made the Catholics more dangerous than they are already. I discard this point with one question,—who are the persons whom we dismiss to secret and eternal discontent? are they three or four millions of our bravest population,—composing a vast proportion of the defenders of our country ACTUALLY IN ARMS!!!—With regard to any real apprehension of danger to our religion on the part of the clergy, one cannot believe that they feel it; I mean the sensible part of them. The rage of catholic or protestant proselytism is, in this part of Europe at least, exploded; and as I am myself a sincere well-wisher to the established reformed church, I should be sorry to see the misplaced zeal of the clergy imputed by enemies to apprehensions of danger to their endowments rather

than to their doctrine.—The next topic is the dismissed ministry. We, many of us, fellow citizens, congratulated the country on their accession to power, because we regarded them as men pledged to capital measures of public freedom and utility. We must with proportionate sorrow have seen them abandon many of those measures; and public favour could not in any degree have left them, if they had not left their principles. In bringing forward the catholic claims, however, they brought forward a vitally important measure in redemption of one of their own solemn pledges: but this measure, thus brought forward, we had the regret to see them withdraw, out of an alledged but false delicacy to the prejudices and scruples of the Sovereign. Whereas we expected that men of a high sense of public honour would not have withdrawn their measure, but would have withdrawn themselves!—Yet it is singular, or ought to be so, and is certainly mortifying, to perceive, that the late ministry having flourished in the favour of the Crown, under many turns of tergiversation, should have been ostensibly dismissed for an attempt to maintain their consistency and their honour in the only grand political instance in which they appear to have recollected either. It is then on this account, that, though we may feel no high regret at their dismissal, we must regret, that this dismissal has been the consequence of an honourable and meritorious part of their conduct (whether wise or otherwise), and with this natural sentiment on seeing an act of honour and principle converted into an instrument for the punishment of its authors, we cannot creditably congratulate his Majesty upon it.—Lastly, fellow citizens, there can be no question of the right of the King to change his ministers as often as his shirt, or his residence.—It is perhaps the only irresponsible (AND NECESSARILY IRRESPONSIBLE) political act, he can exercise; I say NECESSARILY, because, it is an act, he can only exercise himself. And the attempt to bring his CONSTITUTIONAL PERSONAL EXERCISE of this right within the limits of an advised measure, is a pure factious sophism. It is the clear doctrine of the constitution, that the responsible adviser of the Crown must be an official one; and what official adviser can the King have to dismiss his ministers, unless his very ministers themselves? for no body else can give him responsible advice, until these are actually dismissed, and their successors are appointed; who consequently become his subsequent, but not his precedent advisers.—But however disgusted we may be with these factious contentions, in which our, the people's,

interests are never once thought of, we ought to consider, that the disapproving of the selfishness of one set of men is a very different matter from our congratulating His Majesty on the choice he has made of another. Had our worthy Corporation met to congratulate each other on this change of the *depositories of Power*, there would have been something very pleasant, and very natural in it. But when the respectable inhabitants of this considerable Town give their sanction and name to an act of the Corporation, an address so conjointly voted, carries with it an imposing importance, influential upon other places, liable to be converted, as it will be, into an instrument of ministerial support, and which misleading his Majesty as to the opinions which his people have actually formed of his recent measures, cannot but tend to derange his government. —Thinking then as independent men must think, of many of the measures of the late ministry, we may be assured, when we have read their names, that the present will not be more pure, more disinterested, or more patriotic; and looking with a natural anxiety on the prospects of the empire; on the energies which menace, and on those which are to defend us, we can see nothing in the present juncture, on which we can congratulate his Majesty or the Country. —I am aware, it will be observed, that I do no good in finding fault; that I object to the two actual *Contractors and Bidders* for the loan of power and office; but do not point out a third, who will offer better terms for the Public. But fellow citizens what would be the epithets we should deserve for the presumption of attempting to point out an administration! All we can do, and what we have a right to do, is to refuse the sanction of our concurrence to a measure, which we may think does not deserve it. —I conclude in the words of a great foreign philosopher "Il est beau d'écrire ce qu'on pense, c'est le privilège de l'homme." —J. C. WORTHINGTON.

CATHOLIC CLAIMS.

SIR, —As the Catholic question has again become the topic of discussion in your valuable Register, I must beg to intrude upon you a few lines, as it seems the duty of every Protestant who feels anxious for the support of "regular government, social order, and our holy religion," (do not suspect me, Mr. Cobbett, to be a relative of John Bowles) to lend what assistance he may be able in preventing the encroachments of a religious persuasion which he apprehends will certainly tend to undermine so valuable a fabric; and, it is, therefore, with singular

pleasure that I observe with what ardour the Protestants of this country (with the exception of a very few, whose motives and interests we may not be able to probe, and of whom we ought to be extremely wary, circumspect, and jealous) step forward to support the conscientious and paternal care of the Sovereign from preventing that ruin to our religious establishment, as well as that imminent peril in which the constitution would be placed, by allowing to Catholics the liberty of legislating, a measure which would by necessary consequence lead to the introduction of all the errors, all the absurdities, and intolerant principles of Catholicism, with its farcical, but dangerous and crafty attendants transubstantiation, auricular confession, and the infallibility of the successors of Saint Peter; priests who have excited every rational man's indignation for their wantonness of conduct while filling the papal chair in the plenitude of their power, and when in their decline, for the slavish subserviency which they have manifested in becoming the mere spiritual aid-de-camps of an usurper, travelling at his command o'er Alpine snows to fill the despicable characters of a religious mountebank, whenever the crafty policy of the tyrant has deemed it necessary to beguile an enslaved people with some pompous procession. With respect, Sir, to the religion itself, can there be any thing more revolting to the understanding, than the assertion that a class of men are peculiarly under the guidance of our Saviour, are blessed with the inspiration of that grace which renders them infallible, when we observe them at one period of history adopting a line of conduct more consonant with the inveterate sinner than the Christian; and at another, stooping to a voluntary debasement of soul which would meet with scorn and indignation from an English shopkeeper — Sir, your correspondent Simplicius, has my thanks for a very excellent and instructive letter, in which he has unfolded some of the principle tenets of the Catholic faith, and though he has roused the virulence of the orthodox Catholic of Hampstead, who requests Simplicius to shake off the dust of Aberdeen, that he may acquire (I presume) the Catholic polish, I trust that Simplicius possesses more nerve than to be intimidated with the irony or overweening impertinence of any Catholic writer, and that undismayed he will continue to point out the fallacies of the Romish religion, by which will be discerned how inimical its principles are to any rational civil government, and still more to a limited monarchy like our own; a task which Simplicius seems so well able to perform. A. B. who has analyzed the letter of

Simpli
he fou
ted he
plicius
bisho
seems
the gl
cruelt
pel, I
it agai
" sol
" tha
" die
" Ch
" Pop
" teri
" rule
" of
" and
" righ
" Rom
" his
" serv
" mot
" reb
" sers
" SEC
has no
statem
silence
thentic
dited,
such a
of Sim
ascerta
as that
was or
we loc
and pe
minuti
raises
himself
we can
least c
format
the oar
gably
a few
tempt
has gi
claims
table
their q
pare th
that re
Univer
found
possibl
(and h
it has
A. B.
be bet
from

Simplicius, and reiterated such parts of it as he found most convenient to combat, omitted however to repeat the oath which Simplicius informed us is taken by a Catholic bishop at his consecration; and which, as it seems to me so unequivocally to describe the gloomy, the insidious, the persecuting cruelty of the Catholic professors of the gospel, I must request your indulgence to state it again; "the bishop swears in the most solemn manner possible, that he will from that hour forward be faithful and obedient to Saint Peter and to the Holy Church of Rome, and to his Lord the Pope, and his successors canonically entering: that the papacy of Rome, the rules of the holy fathers, and the regalities of Saint Peter, he will keep, maintain, and defend against all men: that the rights, privileges, and authorities of the Roman church, and of the Pope, and of his successors, he will cause to be conserved, defended, augmented, and promoted, and that *heretics, schismatics, and rebels to the Holy Father, and his successors he will resist, and to his power PERSECUTE.*" Sir, A. B. informs us that he has not inquired into the correctness of the statement of the oath, and begs from his silence it may not be concluded to be authentic; but can it be for a moment credited, that A. B. who has laboured with such assiduity to combat all the other parts of Simplicius's statement, should not have ascertained whether so momentous a passage as that which contains the oath in question, was or was not accurately given; but, when we look back to the former letters of A. B., and perceive him so initiated into the very minutiae of the Romish Arcana, that it raises more than a doubt, whether he be not himself a functionary of the Catholic church; we cannot so far indulge him, as to give the least credence to his pretended want of information; and Simplicius's statement of the oath must be taken at present as irrefragably true: but I cannot pass over without a few words the mode in which A. B. attempts to parry the blow which Simplicius has given with this oath to the Catholic claims, and which to the merit of the charitable and humane, must, I imagine, effect their quietus. He says, he intends to compare the oath as stated by Simplicius, with that required from graduates in the English Universities, and which A. B. states will be found equally "pregnant with the utmost possible illiberality, absurdity, and cruelty." (and here, by the bye, let me ask, whether it has the least shade of probability, that A. B. who avows himself a Catholic, should be better acquainted with the oath required from a graduate in an English University,

than that required from a bishop in his own church. I notice this to give a slight idea of Catholic professions, protestations, and assurances.) But, what if the English graduate's oath should be illiberal, absurd, and cruel; is that an argument that we should add to it, more illiberality, more absurdity, and more cruelty: it might be a very fair argument to shew that there ought to be some reformation in a graduates oath, but that such a reformation can be brought about by adding error to error, and absurdity to absurdity; will require more than Catholic ingenuity to establish. Now, Sir, let me ask whether in the face of such an oath as Simplicius has stated, we can listen without indignation at Catholic professions; at assurances that they have renounced the doctrine of paramount power in the Pope, and the persecution of heretics; could we permit ourselves, credulous as we are even to a proverb, to be imposed upon with such assurances (under like circumstances) from any men, more peculiarly from those who have the advantage of indulgence for dissimulation; and when those professions not only contradict their oaths, but the concurrent practice and habits of the Catholics for ages. Sir, as a right understanding of every subject is essentially necessary to the fair discussion of it; and as the Catholic question is of all others the most important for an Englishman's consideration, and therefore, the more necessary to be well understood; and as it is not improbable that when the subject is considered in its true light, there will be found no disinterested Protestant proclaiming himself its supporter, it will be requisite clearly to comprehend the object of the Catholics. Sir, the Catholics have brought forward their claims under most artful disguises; sometimes they are debated under the head of Catholic Toleration; sometimes, as A. B. has spoken of them in his last letter, under the appellation of *Liberal Toleration of the Catholics*; and at other times we have our attention called to the propriety of Catholic Emancipation; now, Sir, these various titles and appellations, are all artificial disguises adopted to mislead the Protestant into a belief, that what the Catholics desire it is next to inhumanity to refuse: but they do not in truth convey to the understanding the smallest idea of what the Catholics really aim at; as we shall immediately perceive, when we consider the nature of the Catholic claims as they must be understood from the different appellations that have been given them.—To tolerate the Catholic religion, can be in fair construction, nothing more than to permit the exercise of it; and a liberal toleration, if it mean any thing, can mean no more than

that the Catholic should be permitted to follow his religion without any interposition from the state—but that toleration they enjoy already to the fullest extent—no pains, no penalties, no restrictive laws, forbid the catholic to worship his Maker in such manner as the holy forms of his religion, or the philosophy of his own mind may dictate; and that too with all the enlightened concomitant excellencies, of lighted candles, masses, holy water, groans, absolution, and auricular confessions; so far then as religion requires, the catholic is tolerated, and liberally tolerated; but when he insists on the temporal power of the pope; when he requires our civil magistrates to listen to any interference of such a nature, that is certainly a toleration (if it can be distorted into such a term) to which a British protestant can, I apprehend, never yield while one ray of wisdom is left him. He revolts, and rationally so, at the idea of the rich murderer resisting the just visitation of the laws, by appearing clothed in the *holy* vestment of a dispensation, which his wealth has enabled him to purchase from some venal successor of Saint Peter.—As to catholic emancipation—that implies a release from the chains of slavery; but is the catholic in bondage? How deceptive then is such a term! that the catholic is liberally tolerated no man can contradict; that he is permitted even to exert a criminal zeal for conversion with impunity, it has been, and probably for some time may be, the misfortune of many families to testify. Instances are not unfrequent where English humanity has received into its family some catholic tutor, whose urgent solicitations have gained him the office, and whose only gratitude for years of kindness and benevolence, has been the surreptitious conversion of the children of his benefactors from the protestant to the catholic faith. This ingratitude, this dishonourable return for accumulated acts of kindness, (much to be lamented) is permitted with impunity; and the catholic ingrate, having thus disturbed the peace of one family, is allowed to act his insidious deceptions in that of another. But what, let me ask, is the condition of a protestant in a catholic country; what was his condition when the Romish power was at its zenith, and catholic incense visited the heavens from the altars of almost every civilized country in Europe? Why, the poor protestant who ventured even in silent seclusion to adore his Creator with humility, was ferreted out by those miscreants called the inquisitors of the holy faith, and roasted probably at an *auto-de-fé*, to the great

amusement of some thousand orthodox professors of the *MERCIES* of our Redeemer. But, Mr. Cobbett, it is time we should remove these disguises, and tell our protestant countrymen that the catholic aim is to become legislators; to become our lawgivers; and, if that were to be allowed, what would be the more than probable consequence; would it not be more than probable that the catholic lawgiver, rooted in all the prejudices of his religion, should endeavour to introduce its *attendant excellencies* and *embellishments*? Is it not natural that he should endeavour to pass a law, authorizing English catholic bishops (for those we shall certainly have) to fulminate bulls *ex cathedra*; to give us an act of parliament enacting the exercise of auricular confession in the *cabinet* of the monarch; and possibly another appropriating inclusively Salisbury-plain, and Smithfield-market for that delicious repast, an *auto-de-fé*; and that all the liberal policy of our revered Queen Mary would again be revived to our great satisfaction and quiet. If there be any so disgusted with our constitution, and religion, as established at the revolution, that the introduction of catholic power is to them a thing desirable; if they wish to make catholics legislators, catholics the king's advisers, catholics commanders of our army and navy, let me ask the men who so think and feel upon what principle the catholics should be excluded from the throne? Sir, the supporters of the catholic measures, conscious that the wantonly hazarding the peace of the country, and the safety of the constitution, would meet with repulse from the least sagacious amongst us, have artfully introduced the plea of necessity; and we are asked, whether, in the present situation of affairs, it is not important that four millions of his majesty's subjects should be united with the rest in defence of the country; Sir, in answer to this, I would demand, *whether the freedom of religion, of trade, life, property, wife, and children*, have not been ever held as stimuli—in the breast of a christian, powerful enough to induce him, with hand and heart, to resist the encroachments of an invader. If there be any persons, Sir, whom these things cannot rouse in defence of their country, can we be so credulous as to believe that the mere possibility of four persons, in the class of four millions to which the catholic belongs, becoming members of parliament, or officers of the staff, is likely to produce any better effect on constitutions so phlegmatic. We have only to mention the proposition to shew its fallacy, and to be aware of the latter, to avoid the delusion it is intended to produce.—ANTI-CATHOLICUS.